



## <Articles>Literal Resultatives, Hyperbolic Resultatives, and Figurative Resultatives

著者	Fukui Ryuta
journal or publication title	Tsukuba English Studies
volume	27
page range	155-169
year	2009-03-06
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2241/102443">http://hdl.handle.net/2241/102443</a>

# Literal Resultatives, Hyperbolic Resultatives, and Figurative Resultatives\*

Ryuta Fukui

## 1. Introduction

This paper presents a semantic analysis of resultative constructions in English. This construction is exemplified in (1):<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. John painted the wall red.
- b. John hammered the metal flat.

Resultative constructions consist of a “NP V NP AP” structure. Furthermore, as their name shows, they characteristically have a phrase that denotes a result. In these constructions, verbs denote activities, and adjectives representatively denote results. In (1), the verbs *paint* and *hammer* denote activities, and the adjectives *red* and *flat* denote results, respectively. The sentences in (1) can be construed by combining each word of the sentences compositionally: Sentence (1a) means that John painted the wall, and as a result, the wall became red. Similarly, sentence (1b) means that John hammered the metal, and as a result, the metal became flat. In addition to adjectival resultative phrases such as *red* and *flat*, I also treat *off* and *out* as resultative phrases in this paper.<sup>2</sup>

Some sentences, which have superficially the same form as the sentences in (1), however, cannot be construed compositionally. In these sentences, verbs denote activities, but adjectives do not denote results. More specifically, adjectives do not denote resultant states that were acquired by activities denoted by verbs. The sentences in (2) are the examples in question:

- (2) a. The joggers ran the pavement thin. (Levin and Rappaport (1999:1))
- b. John cried his eyes out.

Roughly speaking, sentence (2a) can be paraphrased as “the joggers ran very hard.” Similarly, sentence (2b) can be paraphrased as “John cried excessively.” In the sentences in (2), the combination of objects and adjectives shows that the activities denoted by the verbs are overemphasized.<sup>3</sup>

---

\* I am very grateful to TES reviewers for reading earlier versions of this paper and making a number of helpful suggestions. Without their help and patience, this paper would not have been completed. All remaining errors and inadequacies are of course my own.

<sup>1</sup> In this paper, I do not deal with “intransitive resultatives,” as in (i):

- (i) a. The lake froze solid.
- b. The door swung open.

<sup>2</sup> I regard *off* and *out* as resultative phrases in the examples which appear in this paper. My papers such as Fukui (2006) regard them as particles. This is because these words have several distinct properties.

<sup>3</sup> These types of objects are termed as “fake objects” by Simpson (1983).

Why can the sentences in (1) not be construed like “John painted the wall excessively,” and those in (2) like “John cried and as a result, his eyes are out”? What factor does cause the sentences to be construed literally or as having the excessive meaning?

In previous researches such as Miyata (1999), while the excessive meaning of resultative constructions is pointed out, most analyses are based on resultative constructions that can be paraphrased compositionally.

This paper intends to confirm that the resultative construction is not monolithic in terms of semantics. Some resultative constructions specify results but others do not, superficially, at least. This paper also presents several factors to select one from possible meanings. In addition to meanings of resultative constructions which have been discussed in the previous researches, I present another meaning that cannot be classified into them.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents previous researches on resultative constructions, and clarifies two types of resultative constructions, which have been observed. Section 3 differentiates the non-literal resultatives into two types. Section 4 explores how the meanings of the three types of resultative constructions are acquired. Section 5 is dedicated to concluding this paper.

## 2. Previous Researches on Resultative Constructions

In this section, I review some representative previous researches, which have presented two meanings of resultative constructions. Quite a lot of previous researches such as Simpson (1983), Levin and Rappaport (1999), Goldberg (1995), Boas (2003), Washio (1997), and Iwata (2006) observe the construction.

### 2.1. *A Literal Resultative*

Resultative constructions, as the name implies, characteristically have a phrase that denotes a result. Verbs denote activities, and adjectives representatively denote results in resultative constructions. Since Simpson (1983), quite a lot of examples have been presented, as in (3):

- (3) a. She shook her husband awake. (Kageyama (2001:171))
- b. She froze the jelly solid. (Kageyama (2001:161))
- c. He shot the bear dead. (Kageyama (2001:160))

The sentences in (3) are often presented as examples of resultative constructions. In what follows, we review three previous researches in more detail. Firstly, Goldberg (1995) presents the examples in (4):

- (4) a. This nice man probably just wanted Mother to . . . kiss him unconscious.
- b. I had brushed my hair very smooth.
- c. You killed it stone-dead.

(Goldberg (1995:181))

Goldberg (1995) points out that in resultative constructions, the arguments, which are traditionally identified as patients, potentially undergo a change of state as a result of the action denoted by the verb. In sentence (4a), the person, who is referent to the pronoun *him*, underwent a change on his consciousness as a result of his mother's kissing. Similarly, in sentence (4b), *my hair* underwent a change on smoothness as a result of *my brushing*. In sentence (4c), *it* underwent a change on living as a result of *your killing*.

Secondly, Levin and Rappaport (1999) present the following example, as in (5):

- (5) The joggers ran the pavement thin. (= (2a))

Levin and Rappaport (1995) claim that sentence (5) can be paraphrased as either "the joggers ran, and they caused the pavement to become thin" or "the joggers caused the pavement to become thin by running."

Thirdly, Boas (2003) presents the following example in (6):

- (6) I dyed my grey school skirt dark red. (Boas (2003:2))

Boas (2003) paraphrases the sentence in (6) as "I dyed my grey school skirt, and as a result of my dying the skirt it became dark red."

Despite the slight differences, these paraphrases show that the sentences in (4-6) have literal meanings. Here I use the term "literal" if a sentence can be paraphrased compositionally by using each word appearing in the sentence without changing the meanings of each word. The literal resultative construction can be paraphrased as "X V-ed something, and as a result, Y became AP." In the case of (5), here again, the joggers literally ran, and the pavement literally became thin.

## 2.2. A Non-Literal Resultative

In previous researches, some examples other than the literal resultative construction are observed. First, take a look at the examples in (7):

- (7) a. The joggers ran the pavement thin. (= (2a))  
b. John cut his lecture short. (Taniwaki (2006:252))

As mentioned above, Levin and Rappaport (1999) give the example in (7a), and paraphrase it literally:

- (8) The joggers ran on the pavement, and as a result, it became thin.

Resultative constructions do not always have a literal meaning, however. The sentence can also be paraphrased as follows:

- (9) a. The joggers ran excessively.  
b. The joggers ran very hard.

Sentence (7a) can state the excessive running event, not the property of the pavement.

In the non-literal meaning, the paraphrase applied in 2.1 for the literal resultative

construction (i.e. X V-ed something as a result, Y became AP) cannot be maintained, as in (10).

- (10) # The joggers ran on the pavement, and as a result, it became thin.

In the case of (7b), there is no excessive meaning in the sentence. The sentence in (7b) cannot be paraphrased as the literal resultative construction, either.

- (11) # John cut his lecture, and as a result, the lecture became short.

The non-literal resultative construction does not always have an excessive meaning; it is not a unitary construction.

On non-literal resultatives, Miyata (1999) deals with resultatives that have the meaning of exaggeration, and calls them figurative resultatives, and Iwata (2006) deals with the non-literal resultative as a part of adjunct resultatives, according to his classification.<sup>4</sup> However, there seems to be no research that differentiates the non-literal resultative.

So far, I have reviewed the non-literal resultative construction. I have pointed out that although the non-literal resultative construction is not unitary, it has not been well analyzed. In the next section, I propose to divide the non-literal resultative construction into two types: A hyperbolic resultative and a figurative resultative.

### 3. Two Types of Non-Literal Resultative Constructions

#### 3.1. A Hyperbolic Resultative

As we observed in 2.2, a certain type of resultative constructions has an excessive meaning. Let us look at the example in (12):

- (12) The joggers ran the pavement thin. (= (2a))

Goldberg (1995) does not present the same interpretation as Levin and Rappaport (1999) do. While Levin and Rappaport (1999) paraphrase sentence (12) literally, Goldberg (1995) points out that the sentence in (12) has, in her term, a figurative meaning. She states that (12) would not be used to describe an actual change in the thickness of the pavement, or to describe the particular property of the pavement. Put differently, the sentence in (12) does not mean that the pavement has a special characteristic that it became thin in case people ran on it. Sentences like (12), which she calls the fake object cases, are often used as hyperbole to express the idea that the action performed was done to excess. Accordingly, the sentence in (12) can also be paraphrased as follows:

- (13) a. The joggers ran excessively.  
b. The joggers ran very hard.

---

<sup>4</sup> Iwata (2006) proposes to differentiate between adjunct resultatives and argument resultatives. In adjunct resultatives like “John slid the door shut,” the verb entails the resultative state expressed by the adjective. On the other hand, in argument resultatives like “John hammered the metal flat,” the verb does not entail the resultative state.

(= (9))

Other examples of non-literal resultatives are also observed in (14):

- (14) a. He ran his Nikes threadbare. (Carrier and Randall (1992:201))  
 b. Mary walked her soles off.  
 c. He will talk your ear off. (Kageyama (2001:171))

The examples in (14) can also be paraphrased as follows:

- (15) a. He ran {excessively/very hard}.  
 b. Mary walked {excessively/very hard}.  
 c. He will talk {excessively/very hard}.

Miyata (1999) points out that some sentences of resultative constructions admit of either a literal or a figurative reading. In Miyata's terminology, the sentence in (16) is an example of the "figurative" resultative construction:

- (16) Mary cried her eyes red. (Miyata (1999:23))

According to Miyata (1999), sentence (16) has two possible readings; one is that Mary cried, and as a result, her eyes became red, and the other is Mary cried very hard.

Resultative constructions as in (12) and (14) have an excessive meaning. The event denoted by the verb is exaggerated by the following object and adjective.

From now on, I use the terms "hyperbolic" if a sentence cannot be paraphrased literally, and if a sentence has a meaning of doing something hard or excessively. In the hyperbolic resultatives, objects and adjectives can be deleted without changing the meaning of the whole sentence, and the adverb "excessively" can be added instead of them.

### 3.2. A Figurative Resultative

Here I clarify another example of the non-literal resultative construction that cannot be classified into the hyperbolic resultative. Let us observe the examples in (17):

- (17) John *cut* his lecture *short*. (= (7b))

In her discussion, Taniwaki (2006) deals with (17) in the same way as other resultatives without giving any further comment on meanings. She seems to regard (17) as a sentence having a literal meaning. However, the following paraphrase in (18) is not adequate. Here, I put a double cross mark on the sentence, because this paraphrase itself may be grammatical but the meaning is very odd.

- (18) # John cut his lecture, and as a result, it became short.

Furthermore, sentence (17) does not have an excessive meaning because the following paraphrase is impossible.

- (19) # John cut excessively.

According to my informant, the sentence in (17) are to be paraphrased as "John ended his lecture," not as "#John cut his lecture, and as a result, his lecture became short." When we say

*cut the lecture*, it usually means that we do not *attend* the lecture. Even when the verb *cut* means to *reduce* the length of the lecture, the sentence cannot mean that the lecture, which was long, became shorter as a result of John's cutting. Dictionaries define *cut short* as follows:

(20) *cut short*

- a. to suddenly bring something to an end before it has properly finished. (LDOCE<sup>3</sup>)
- b. to end abruptly; terminate (Dictionary.com)

That is, in sentence (17), *the lecture*, which was expected to be longer than its actual length, was ended earlier than expected. It never means that the lecture, which was long, became short as a result of John's cutting, because the lecture is concerned deeply with the flow of time, and we cannot compress and expand the time or manage to make the time short or long. All we can do is to stop the lecture at a certain point of time.

In addition, in (17), the lecture does not have to be short, because the following sentence in (21) is totally acceptable:

- (21) a. John cut his lecture short but the lecture was not short at all; it was too late to stop.
- b. John cut the lecture short because it had already been long.

From the facts above, it cannot be said that the sentence in (17) has a literal meaning, as we discussed in 2.1.

In addition, as Iwata (2006) observes, *cut NP short* may be used both in a physical sense and in an abstract sense. *Cut short NP* only pertains to a temporal length of one's stay or holiday, etc., as seen in (22):

- (22) a. She returned to London on the 21st, cutting short her stay in Paris.
- b. The couple were ordered by station bosses to cut short their holiday and hurry back to work.
- c. President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak cut short an official five-day visit to China (where he had arrived on that day) to return to Egypt.

(Iwata (2006:482))

Actually, *cut short NP* cannot be used with purely physical objects, as in (23).<sup>5</sup> The examples

---

<sup>5</sup> Interestingly, as in (ia-b), the verb *cut* is able to take objects such as *the tree*, but *cut NP short* cannot take such objects any more. On the other hand, *cut NP short* still can take objects like *the hair*. However, the sentence in (ic) is no longer acceptable whether the object is *the tree* or *the hair*.

- (i) a. She cut the tree.
- b. \* She cut the tree short. /<sup>K</sup> She cut the hair short.
- c. \* She cut short the tree/the hair.

This can be the evidence of the gradable figurativeness of resultative constructions: There is a degree of

in (23) are what we call literal resultatives:

- (23) a. She cut her {hair/fingernails/trousers} short.  
 b. \* She cut short her {hair/fingernails/trousers}.

(Iwata (2006:482))

Taniwaki (2006) also observes that, in resultative constructions, adjectival resultative predicates may show up not only in the canonical post-object position, as in (24a), but sometimes also in the pre-object position or immediately after the main verb, as in (24b):

- (24) a. John *cut* his lecture *short*.  
 b. John *cut short* his lecture.

(Taniwaki (2006:251))

Unlike the verb particle constructions, which have two word orders as in “John *threw up* the ball” and “John *threw* the ball *up*,” resultative constructions generally do not admit the word order where an adjective comes before an object. The possibility of two word orders, accordingly, is peculiar to this type of resultative constructions.

From the facts that (i) *cut NP short* means to end NP, (ii) the sentence “John cut the lecture short” should not be paraphrased as “#John cut his lecture, and as a result, his lecture became short,” and (iii) *cut short NP* is only acceptable if the NP is not a physical object, we should say that the sentence (17) does not belong to the literal resultative construction. Since there is no excessive meaning, sentence (17) does not belong to the hyperbolic resultative construction, either. I pose a third type of resultative constructions which cannot be classified either literal resultative constructions or hyperbolic resultative constructions. The resultative construction of the third type selects the particular objects, which is temporal, not physical. I call this type of the resultative construction the “figurative” resultative construction.

In this section, I have proposed to classify the non-literal resultative construction into two types. In addition to the literal resultatives and hyperbolic resultatives, I have discussed the existence of figurative resultatives.

#### 4. Analyses

So far, we observed the three types of resultative constructions: A literal resultative, a hyperbolic resultative, and a figurative resultative. A literal resultative is the resultative construction, which characteristically has a phrase that denotes result. Verbs denote activities and adjectives representatively denote results in the constructions. Sentences of the literal resultative construction can be paraphrased compositionally by using each word appearing in the sentence without changing meanings of each word. A hyperbolic resultative is the resultative construction which expresses the idea that the action performed was done to excess. Sentences

---

figurativeness of resultative constructions. However, I leave this problem for the future research.



of the hyperbolic resultative construction cannot be paraphrased literally, and have a meaning of doing something hard or excessively. A figurative resultative is the resultative construction that cannot be classified into either literal or hyperbolic resultative constructions. The combination of the verbs and adjectives comes to have idiom-like meanings and select the particular objects.

Now a question arises: What can be said from these three types of resultative constructions? How are the differences among the types explicated? In the following, we pursue the theoretical background.

#### 4.1. *Analyses on Literal Resultative Constructions*

By introducing the notion of scales of adjectives, Wechsler (2005) analyzes resultative constructions. He claims that adjectives in the resultative construction must guarantee the telicity of resultative constructions. Wechsler (2005) claims that maximal endpoint closed-scale gradable adjectives such as *full*, *empty*, *straight*, and *dry* can appear in resultative constructions. Because they have an inherent lexical standard, or, in other words, an endpoint, they can guarantee the telicity of resultative constructions. Non-gradable adjectives, which serve an endpoint, such as *dead* can also appear in resultative constructions. On the other hand, open-scale gradable adjectives such as *long*, *wide*, *short*, and *cool*, and minimum endpoint closed-scale adjectives, which can be regarded as (de facto) open-scale adjectives, such as *wet* and *dirty* cannot appear in resultative constructions because they do not have endpoints.<sup>6,7</sup>

Wechsler's (2005) account can be maintained in the discussion of literal resultatives. However, Wechsler (2005) does not consider hyperbolic and figurative resultatives. While it is certain that resultative constructions should be treated primarily as having literal meanings for explanatory convenience, the resultative construction that has meanings other than literal ones cannot be ignored because we observe quite a lot of them.

#### 4.2. *Analyses on Hyperbolic Resultative Constructions*

In the case of hyperbolic resultatives, Wechsler's (2005) account cannot be applied. In

---

<sup>6</sup> According to Quirk et al (1985), and Huddleston and Pullum (2002), adjectives can be classified into two types: One is the non-gradable adjective such as *dead*, *triangular*, *invited*, and *sold*. These adjectives do not accept degree modifiers such as *very*, *quite*, *extremely* or the comparatives. The other is the gradable adjective such as *long*, *flat*, *expensive*, *straight*, *full*, and *dull*. They accept degree modifiers or the comparatives. Wechsler (2005) surely claims that the non-gradable adjectives can be the result phrase but he only presents examples with the adjective *dead*. Generally speaking, the adjectives such as *triangular*, *invited*, and *sold* do not appear in the resultative construction. Wechsler (2005), however, does not give any comment on this problem.

<sup>7</sup> Some researches such as Ono (2007) present discussions against Wechsler (2005). In this paper, I do not deal with these oppositions among them.

Wechsler (2005), the discussion presupposes the telic nature of resultative constructions. The idea that resultative constructions are telic is true as long as they are the literal, as shown in (25):

- (25) a. John painted the wall red {\*for ten days/in ten days}.  
 b. John hammered the metal flat {\*for ten days/in ten days}.

In (25), only the *in*-phrases are accepted. Hence, the literal resultative construction is telic.

On the other hand, in hyperbolic resultatives, this presupposition does not maintain, as shown in (26):

- (26) a. The joggers ran the pavement thin {for ten days/in ten days}.  
 b. John cried his eyes out {for ten days/??in ten days}.

In (26), the *for*-phrases are accepted. Hence, the hyperbolic resultative construction is not always telic.

For hyperbolic resultatives, the account of “event composition” (cf. Levin and Rappaport (1999)) is superior to Wechsler’s. It does not have to take the telicity into consideration. The event composition is the derivation of a single event description expressed in one clause from two lexical heads that could have been used in the description of independent events, each expressed in a distinct clause.

According to the notion of event composition, the resultative construction as in (26) is made of two events. Let us explain it by using the sentence in (27):

- (27) John painted the wall red. (= (1a))

This is the example of the literal resultative construction. Sentence (27) can be paraphrased as “John painted the wall and as a result, the wall became red,” or “John’s painting on the wall caused the wall to become red.” There is a causal relation between the two events. Because the paraphrase of (27) is thus possible, Levin and Rappaport (1999) claim that the causal relation between two events must hold in this type of event composition.<sup>8</sup>

How can we apply this account to hyperbolic resultatives? Levin and Rappaport (1999) present the following example but regard it as a literal resultative construction, and explain it as follows:

---

<sup>8</sup> A certain resultative construction does not seem to have a causal relation. Observe the example in (i):

- (i) a. The pond froze solid.  
 b. \*The pond became solid by freezing.  
 c. \*The pond froze CAUSE the pond BECOME solid.

In this case, the freezing event and the solidifying event coincide. In other words, the two events are temporally dependent. Because the causal relation cannot be explicitly represented, Levin and Rappaport (1999) claim that this event in (i) has a simple event structure formed from the composition of two necessarily temporally dependent “coidentified” events. These types of resultatives that have no object should be treated within the framework of Wechsler’s (2005), but we do not discuss this in the present paper.

- (28) The joggers ran the pavement thin. (= (2a))

Sentences (28) can be expressed in separate clauses as in “the joggers ran and they caused the pavement to become thin.” This paraphrase is the one for the literal resultative. This expression is, however, much more often used in expressing activities that are done excessively than in expressing an actual result caused by the activities. The sentence in (28) is an example of the hyperbolic resultative construction, but Levin and Rappaport (1999) do not give any comment on this.

Let us start with the characteristic of objects, which are put right after the verb. It is very common that the affected theme is directly selected by verbs, as in *John ate the apple*, where John’s eating event obviously affects the object *the apple*. In this line, the objects *the pub*, *the pavement*, and *his shoes* in (29) should be affected by the actions denoted by each verb:

- (29) a. John drank the pub dry.  
 b. The joggers ran the pavement thin.  
 c. The man walked his shoes threadbare.

If we consider the meanings of the sentences in (29), however, we can notice that the postverbal NPs in (29) are not affected themes. One reason is that the hyperbolic resultatives in (29) are usually paraphrased, as in (30), unlike the paraphrase of the literal resultative construction, as in (31):

- (30) a. John drank excessively as if the pub became dry.  
 b. The joggers ran excessively as if the pavement became thin.  
 c. The man walked excessively as if his shoes became threadbare.  
 (31) a. \* John drank the pub and as a result, it became dry.  
 b. \* The joggers ran the pavement and as a result, it became thin.  
 c. \* The man walked his shoes and as a result, they became threadbare.

Another reason is that, as shown in (32), the NPs are not selected by the verb:

- (32) a. \* John drank the pub.  
 b. \* The joggers ran the pavement.  
 c. \* The man walked his shoes.

The important thing is that the NP between the verb and adjective denotes the location where the event takes place. When the adjectives are removed, the prepositions denoting location need to be added as in (33):

- (33) a. John drank in the pub.  
 b. The joggers ran on the pavement  
 c. The man walked in his shoes.

In (33a), the drinking event is held in the pub. In (33b), the running event is held on the pavement. In (33c), the walking event is held by wearing his shoes.

What function do the NPs have, then? What should not be missed here is that the event

denoted by the verb is held in the place that the object shows.<sup>9</sup> In a hyperbolic resultative, verbs by themselves do not select the objects, and the objects denote the locations where the events shown by the verb take place.<sup>10</sup> The affected object literally denotes something that is affected, and location is not affected by the activity denoted by the verb. The point is that the event denoted by the verb does not affect the location denoted usually by prepositional phrases or adverbs. That is, the situation where the location is affected is anomalous. In hyperbolic resultatives, the event denoted by the verb behaves as if it affects the location denoted by the object. Thus, this abnormality is one of the factors of bearing the hyperbolic meanings of the hyperbolic resultative construction.

How about the meaning of adjectives in (29)? Grammatically, the adjectives in (29) can be predicated of the object NPs, as shown in (34):

- (34) a. # The pub is dry.  
       b. # The pavement is thin.  
       c. # His shoes are threadbare.

According to my informants, however, these expressions are not usual. If they say that people drank all the alcohol in the pub, they say that the pub ran out of alcohol. If they say that the pavement became rough or the shoes became scuffed, they usually say that the pavement or the shoes are worn out. Hence, these expressions are not usual. The adjectives in (34) do not have literal meanings but have metaphoric meanings.

As I presented above, the location is usually not affected by the event denoted by the verb, and the verb's object is usually affected by the event denoted by the verb. Therefore, it is anomalous that the location which is denoted by the verb's object is affected. Because of the abnormality of expressing location as an object, this type of resultatives comes to have a hyperbolic meaning.

#### 4.3. *Analyses on Figurative Resultative Constructions*

In this subsection, I deal with the figurative resultative construction in (35):

- (35) John cut his lecture short. (= (7b))

Sentence (35) can be paraphrased neither as “\*John cut and he caused his lecture to become short” nor as “\*John caused his lecture to become short by cutting.” Of course it cannot be paraphrased as “John cut his lecture excessively.” As we discussed in 3.2, neither the literal resultative nor the hyperbolic resultative includes the figurative resultative construction.

---

<sup>9</sup> Here, I regard “his shoes” in (33c) as a location, too. The complement of preposition can be treated as a location by introducing the notion of “proto-role” by Dowty (1991) and “macro-role” by Kaga (2007)

<sup>10</sup> Roughly speaking, the affected object, which is equivalent to *figure* in Talmy's (1987, 2000) terms, is contrasted with the location, which is equivalent to Talmy's *ground*.

It is not adequate to apply Wechsler's (2005) account to the figurative resultative construction. Wechsler (2005) argues that adjectives whose scale is closed can appear in resultative constructions. What should not be missed here is that Wechsler's account presupposes that verbs that appear in resultative constructions denote actions, and usually have literal meanings. In the literal resultative construction, which is exemplified in (36a), the verb *paint* has a literal meaning; that is, to change the color of something by putting paint on the surface. In the hyperbolic resultative construction in (36b), too, the verb *cry* has a literal meaning, that is, to produce tears from eyes because of unhappiness or pain.

(36) a. John painted the wall red. (= (1a))

b. John cried his eyes out. (= (2b))

On the contrary, in the case of the figurative resultative construction, the verb is not used literally. Let us take example (35) as an example. First, as we have seen in 3.2, the verb *cut* does not have a literal meaning, that is, to divide something into two or more pieces using a sharp tool. In this case, the verb has a metaphoric meaning, that is, to end or stop something.

Moreover, the verb *cut* solely cannot take the object *his lecture* anymore, as shown in (37):

(37) a. \* John cut his lecture.

b. John cut {the tree/the hair/the woodblock}.

This is a piece of evidence that shows the verb *cut* in the figurative resultative construction does not have a literal meaning, but has a metaphoric meaning.

How about the adjectives? At first look, the adjectives can normally predicate of an object as shown in (38):

(38) # His lecture is short.

However, as discussed in 3.2, the adjective *short* does not have the same meaning in the construction, because the following negations are possible:

(39) a. John cut his lecture short but the lecture was not short at all; it was too late to stop.

b. John cut the lecture short because it had already been long.

(= (21))

The adjective does not have their original meaning any more.

For the same reason, it is not adequate to apply the Levin and Rappaport's (1999) account to this type of resultative constructions. They claim that resultative constructions are constructed through the derivation of a single event description expressed in one clause from two lexical heads. If these lexical heads could be used in the description of independent events, they could be expressed in a distinct clause. As shown in (37a), the event cannot be expressed in one clause. Because the lexical head does not describe an independent event, the event-compositional account by Levin and Rappaport (1999) cannot be used to explain the

figurative resultative construction.

Here, Taniwaki (2006) observes that this construction admits the verb-adjective-NP order, as shown in (40):

- (40) a. John *cut* his lecture *short*.  
 b. John *cut short* his lecture.

(= (24))

It is peculiar that only the figurative resultative construction has the changeability of word order. In the literal and hyperbolic resultative construction, only one word order is admitted, as shown in (41-42):

- (41) a. John painted the wall red. (= (1))  
 b. \* John painted red the wall.  
 (42) a. The joggers ran the pavement thin. (= (2))  
 b. \* The joggers ran thin the pavement.

From these facts above, we suggest that the verbs and adjectives in the figurative resultative constructions form a complex predicate, as shown in (43):

- (43) John [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>V</sub> cut short] his lecture].

To validate this suggestion, I must further make detailed discussions in the future research, but I note that the number of examples that belong to the figurative resultative construction is small. I can only mention several examples such as *cut short*, *break open* and *cut loose*. This fact may be a clue to the solution. The figurative resultative construction, which has only a small number of examples, is contrary to the verb particle constructions, which have a plenty of examples of figurative meanings (see, for example, Fraser (1976), Fukui (2007)). This is because adjectives have much more distinct meanings than particles. It is difficult for adjectives to lose their original meanings compared to particles.

#### 4.4. Summary

From the observation above, the following can be said: In the literal resultative construction, verbs and adjectives have their original meanings. Following Wechsler (2005), the adjectives guarantee the telic nature of resultative constructions. In the hyperbolic resultative construction, verbs have their original meanings, and objects denote a location, which is an unusual expression in English. Adjectives do not have their original meanings. In the figurative resultative construction, verbs take objects but the objects cannot be taken solely by the verb. Adjectives are predicated of the objects but have no original meaning. Adjectives form complex predicates with verbs. These are charted in (44):

(44)

	Verb's meaning	Object's characteristics	Adjective's meaning
Literal Resultatives	literal	affected theme	literal
Hyperbolic Resultatives	literal	non-affected things, usually location	metaphoric
Figurative Resultatives	metaphoric	peculiar theme which verbs cannot take solely	metaphoric

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper I showed that the resultative construction is not monolithic, and can be classified into three groups in terms of the nature of their verbs and adjectives. In the literal resultative, both verbs and adjectives have literal meanings. In the hyperbolic resultative, the objects denote the location where the event takes place, and these objects are not usually taken by the verbs. In the figurative resultative, verbs and adjectives possibly form complex predicates. Consequently, the permissive object is changed, compared to the case where the verbs and objects appear independently. Following Wechsler (2005), in the literal resultative, verbs denote activities, and adjectives make the resultative construction telic. In the hyperbolic resultative, both verbs and adjectives denote events but an event shown by adjectives functions as an intensifier of the event denoted by the verb. In the figurative resultative, by forming a complex predicate with adjectives, the combination of verbs and adjectives denotes one event.

## REFERENCES

- Boas, Hans (2003) *A Constructional Approach to Resultatives*, CLSI Publications, Stanford.
- Carrier, Jill and Janet H. Randall. (1992) "The Argument Structure and Syntactic Structure of Resultatives," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 173-234.
- Dowty, David. (1991) "Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection." *Language* 67, 560-582.
- Dictionary.com [<http://www.dictionary.com>]
- Fraser, Bruse (1976) *The Verb-Particle Combination in English*, Academic Press, New York.
- Fukui, Ryuta (2006) "Verb Particle Constructions: Their Meanings and Word Orders," *Tsukuba English Studies* 25, 107-115. University of Tsukuba.
- Fukui, Ryuta (2007) "Dooshi Fuhenkashi Koobun: Gojun to Jukugosei no Kakawari," *JELS* 24, 31-40.
- Goldberg, Adele (1995) *Constructions*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Huddleston, Rodney D. and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Iwata, Seizi (2006) "Argument Resultatives and Adjunct Resultatives in a Lexical Constructional Account, The Case

- of Resultatives with Adjectival Result Phrases,” *Language Sciences* 28, 449-496.
- Kaga, Nobuhiro (2007) *Thematic Structure: A Theory of Argument Linking and Comparative Syntax*, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Kageyama, Taro (2001) *Dooshi no Imi to Koobun*, Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport (1999) *Two Structures for Compositionally Derived Events*, ms. University of Massachusetts.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English 3rd ed, (1995), [LDOCE<sup>3</sup>]
- Miyata, Akiko (1999) “Two Types of Resultatives” *Tsukuba English Studies* 18, 23-41, University of Tsukuba.
- Ono, Naoyuki (2007) “Kekka Jutsugo no Sukeeru Koozoo to Jishoo Taipu,” *Kekka Kobun Kenkyu no Shin Shiten*, 67-101, ed. by Ono Naoyuki, Hituzi Shobo, Tokyo.
- Quirk, Randolph, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London.
- Simpson, Louis (1983) “On Resultative Predicates,” *Linguistic Research* 4, 1-13.
- Talmy, Leonard (1987) “Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms,” *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 3: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, Cambridge University Press, London.
- Talmy, Leonard (2000) *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, 1, 2, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Taniwaki, Yasuko (2006) “Resultative Verb-Adjective Combinations as Lexical Compounds,” *Lexicon Forum* 2, 251-280.
- Washio, Ryuichi (1997) “Resultatives, Compositionality and Language Variation,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 1-49.
- Wechsler, Stephen (2005) “Resultatives Under the Event-Argument Homomorphism: Model of Telicity,” *The Syntax of Aspect-Deriving Thematic and Aspectual Interpretation*, ed. by Nomi Erteschik-Shir and Tova Rapoport, 255-273, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Doctoral Program in Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Tsukuba

email: ryutough@gmail.com